

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are pending

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 were rejected.

Claim 5 was previously cancelled.

Claims 9, 14, and 17 are cancelled herein.

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-13, 15, and 18-20 are amended herein.

Claims 22 and 23 are new. No new matter is added.

PETITION TO REVIVE UNDER 37 CFR §1.137(b) & 37 CFR §1.17(m)

This Petition is being filed in response to the Notice of Abandonment dated April 16, 2008. Applicant is filing herewith a Petition to Revive under 37 CFR §1.137(b), as the failure to respond was unintentional. The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional. Authorization to pay the petition fee is included with this response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 15, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph.

Applicant herein cancels claims 9 and 17, making the rejection of these claims moot. Claims 7, 15 and 20 are amended to recite language strings. Support for the amendment may be found at page 5 lines 8-17 and page 6 lines 12-15, for example. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 9, 15, 17 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hetherington (U.S. Patent 6,396,515).

The rejection is traversed; however, claims 1-4, 7, 10-13, 15, and 18-20 are amended to expedite prosecution. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite a method, comprising:

- starting an application, the application having a user interface comprising original text drawn in a first language;
- receiving a selection of a second language from among a plurality of languages;
- identifying an external language file associated with the second language, the external language file comprising a plurality of language strings; and
- redrawing the user interface in the second language by replacing the original text drawn in the user interface with one or more of the language strings of the external language file without closing the application.

Hetherington describes a software application that provides for dynamic switching of languages. When a language request is received, the user interface of the software application is reloaded with text supplied from a language specific file (Abstract).

At the first paragraph of page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Hetherington's software application fails to disclose the external language file recited by claim 1. Instead, the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the file would be either internal or external.

Applicant agrees in part with the Examiner namely that in view of Hetherington, it would be appreciated that the language-specific files of Hetherington are internal to, or included as part of, the software application (col. 3 lines 59-65). However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that it would be obvious to modify Hetherington in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Instead, Hetherington describes that the software application is segregated into functional components and language components (col. 1 lines 27-31) when the application software is developed (col. 5 lines 12-21). Even though the functional and language components are segregated, they still form part of the overall software application of Hetherington. Hetherington fails to describe how the application would operate, or how the interface would be reloaded with text, if the language specific-files were replaced with external language files, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also believed to be allowable as depending on claim, in addition to the further novel features recited therein. For example, amended claim 3 recites the method of

claim 1, further comprising modifying the plurality of language strings to include the one or more language strings, wherein the plurality of language files are configured to be modified without modifying the application. Since Hetherington's functional and language components are provided as sub-parts of the same software application (col. 1 lines 27-31, and col. 3 lines 59-65), it follows that a modification of either of the functional or language components would also result in a modification of the software application itself. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 18 are believed to be allowable for similar reasons as claim 1, in addition to the further novel features recited therein. For example, claim 10 recites, in part, a computer system configured to redraw the user interface in the selected language by replacing the text with one or more of the language strings of the external language file without closing the application, wherein the external language file resides in the computer system external to the application. Hetherington, on the other hand, teaches that the language component is integral to the software application, and as described above.

Claims 11-16 and 19-21 are believed to be allowable as depending on claims 10 and 18 in addition to the further novel features recited therein. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10-16 and 18-21 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hetherington as applied to claims 8 and 16 above, and further in view of Chou (U.S. Patent 5,583,761).

As claims 9 and 17 are cancelled herein, the rejection is believed to be moot.

New Claims

Support for new claims 22 and 23 may be found at page 5 lines 1-17, for example.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases, Applicant may have amended or argued the allowability of independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of the dependent claims.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16, and 18-23 of the application as amended. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick

Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170